

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SOLUTION OF WAR.

BY THE REV. DR. H. PEREIRA MENDES.

THE solution of war is Palestine.

"Palestine?" readers will ask. "How can that or any other country affect the abstract question of how to abolish war?"

The cessation of war! What a dream! What a consummation to be devoutly wished for!

Let calm, practical, sober logic be heard, and thousands of men of common-sense will say it can never be.

But it is just calm, practical, sober logic which we would invoke in order to show how great a step forward even this generation can take in the direction of the reign of law, the rule of right, the cessation of war, and the maintenance of peace.

For what can be more calm, more practical, more sober logic than that which is associated with the domain of the lawyer? And it is to the lawyer, the passionless lawyer, we must look for the initial labor, and for much more than is initial, in the attempt to attain this much-desired end.

For undoubtedly it must be conceded that the power, gradually developed, which has tended to prevent wars by diplomatic effort—and in many an instance, has actually succeeded—is what is known as international law. It follows, therefore, that for its further efficacy or potency we must look to the masters of law, who alone can unfold its possibilities.

International law has proved its usefulness many times and in many directions.

In the minds of ordinary readers it is usually identified with such questions as harbor, river, or fishery rights, rights of belligerents, protectorates, annexations, residents or capital in foreign countries, navigation of the high seas, search rights, three-mile limits, extradition, Monroe doctrine, protection versus free-vol. CLXI.—NO. 465.

trade, international copyright, patent or trade-mark law, international cables, canals, tunnels, etc.

But as stated by Professor Amos, of University College, London, England, it has these additional functions to perform:

- (a) To facilitate intercourse of states and their citizens in time of peace.
 - (b) To obviate and determine the occasions of war.
 - (c) To moderate the severities and restrict the area of war.

A clear comprehension of international law is essential for diplomatic settlement of international differences, and for the extension of a recognition of its utility, wisdom, and justice.

Hence a codification is imperatively demanded in the interests of peace, progress, and human happiness, to all of which war is so distinctly inimical.

This codification should and would be 'the embodiment of the purest reason and the loftiest morality." It would have for its sole end such an adjustment of the relations of the several states of the world as would best enable each to contribute its share to the welfare and moral advancement of all.

This would require a congress of the recognized leading jurists of the world to form a scientific opinion upon the existing state of international law; to gather, collate, sift, and point all principles and rules which affect or are likely to affect international intercourse, and to correct unjust precedents.

This would be a legitimate evolution from the beginnings of Balthasar Ayala, Alberico Gentili, Grotius, Pufendorf and Vattel, from the attempt of Prof. Bluntschli to correct "glaring gaps, contradictions, and ambiguities," and from Mr. Dudley Field's able effort to present international law in an ideal form.

Such a codification would be the first step towards the prevention of war. And the prayers of the civilized world would be with the governments convening such a congress of jurists, as with the jurists themselves in their labors.

The second step would be the education of public opinion :-

- (1) To recognize the equality of populations, morally and spiritually, and to understand that even the smallest states have rights and functions which ought to be respected.
- (2) To encourage commercial and social intercourse between nations and the consequent growth of mutual interests which may not be lightly imperilled.

- (3) To extend proper political franchise and personal liberty.
- (4) To cultivate a knowledge of what war means.
- (5) To correct spurious patriotism, by which we mean patriotism based upon wrong or unjust argument. For example, French patriotism cries for Alsace and Lorraine, but these provinces were originally German. Why blame Germany for taking back what once was hers? German patriotism says "Keep Alsace and Lorraine, because they were originally German." Why then does not Germany restore Silesia, which properly is Austrian? Italy made a grand and successful fight for Italian independence, Germany for German unity. Several powers strove nobly and successfully for the independence of Greece. But the "spurious patriotism" of the powers which "partitioned" Poland prevents the independence and unity of that country—a country once not impotent in the councils of Europe's nations and one to which Europe is as much indebted for hurling back the tide of Mohammedan invasion through her king Sobieski, as it is to Greece for stemming the tide of Persian invasion through a Leonidas or a Themistocles.

Russia expels Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in pursuance of the "Russia for the Russians" policy. The civilized world calls that a "spurious patriotism" which drives out or coops up lawabiding and industrious citizens. The United States is, of all nations on earth, the most solemnly pledged to further the cause of popular and constitutional liberty, of which she is the very apostle. Yet a "spurious patriotism" makes her pronounce invariably for Russia, where there is anything but popular or constitutional liberty-shall we say especially where England is concerned? Never is American patriotism more spurious than when it is called forth against that very England to which she owes so much that is glorious in her fibre, her sentiments, her literature, her institutions, her liberties, and most important of her very religion! Never is it more spurious and more regrettable than when it impedes the natural destiny of Anglo-Saxondom—ultimate union to the real advantage of each of its constituent nations.

Following the codification of international law and the education of public opinion, a third step towards the prevention of war would be the institution of arbitration as an accepted principle, and its recognition as the duty and prerogative of an international court, duly and permanently established.

As to the actual and possible wrongs of war we need only recapitulate its costs and curses, viz.:

- (a) Standing armies, or millions of men consumers instead of producers; the general community therefore not only taxed to support them, but deprived of their contributions toward the general prosperity and toward the lessening of the general burdens.
- (b) The withdrawal of just so many brains and pairs of hands from the agricultural, mining, manufacturing, and other industries, and from laboratory, study, and office, wherein means are devised for enterprises which would supply work for thousands of men and women, to the increase of the country's resources.

The following figures are significant:

| | Cost of army and navy. | Revenue. | Men withdrawn from industrial pursuits. | Taxes could be reduced. |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| France England Germany United States. | \$174,000,000 | \$670,000,000 | 500,000 | One-quarter. |
| | 180,000,000 | 488,000,000 | 360,000 | One-third. |
| | 118,000,000 | 300,000,000 | 500,000 | One-third. |
| | 80,000,000 | 385,818,629 | 30,000 | One-fifth. |

In twenty European states the cost of army and navy is \$1,638,000,000; debt, \$25,000,000,000; soldiers, or men withdrawn from industrial pursuits, available 22,621,800! That is to say, there are 22,000,000 standing arguments against a religion of peace and good will; 22,000,000 arguments against any claim for a civilization more ethical than that of old Rome; 22,000,000 arguments to show that it is time to make religion a power for good—the life-influencing power it was meant to be.

- (c) War means "glorious victories," which term, translated into plainer English, means thousands of widows, more orphans, countless broken hearts, shadowed lives and shattered homes; brave men killed, more wounded, vet more stricken with diseases caught in the field; strong men made burdens for life on the community; and in this country the awful scandal and farreaching injustice of the pension list.
- (d) War means military and naval budgets, which summon the clouds of national bankruptcy and keep aglow the embers of discontent. Witness Italy to-day.
 - (e) Legacies of national hatred, jealousy, and ill-feeling. We

note a regrettable change in French sentiment towards England, due to clashing Eastern interests. Imagine war between France and Great Britain! They have been friends for decades and are bound by myriad ties. It is no impossibility. But what a blot on civilization! They would be face to face as foes in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America! It would mean a spread of the blood lust which lurks in men's hearts. It would mean endless complications. Few countries in the world but would feel them. Few homes in both lands but would sympathize with hearts dark with the shadow of death. Few hearts but would be wrung with the echoing moan of sorrow. Alas! It would mean kinsman against kinsman.

(f) War means the brute argument of tooth and claw. What an insult to our intelligence! What an insult to Christianity, the religion professed by earth's great nations! Yet we are told that preparation for war is a necessity. Gladstone expressed his misgivings to a parliamentary deputation, asking that overtures be made for a mutual disarmament of the powers, and he spoke as premier of England! Caprivi put his foot on the mere proposition! And he spoke as Chancellor of mighty Germany.

Arbitration is suggested as a remedy.

The examples already offered, especially by England and the United States, are brilliant pages in the annals of humanity.

From a paper of Professor Semmes, of the Louisiana University, read at the recent Chicago Religious Congress, we learn that the idea and practice of arbitration for national differences have steadily gained ground. This is the best, because most practical, argument for its utility. He says that from 1793 to 1848, a period of fifty-five years, there were nine such arbitrations—only nine. In the next twenty-two years there were fifteen, in the next ten years there were fourteen, and in the last thirteen years there have been thirteen; that is to say, in the last forty-five years arbitration has averted forty-two wars.

But arbitration has its dangers. The care which must be exercised in selecting arbitrators shows to what an extent distrust exists.

Small powers are often chosen, as if the greater the power, the greater the possibilities of interests being involved which might warp judgment.

For example. Suppose England and Russia clash in the East—no remote contingency—can England accept France as arbitrator? Not at all. For France is irate with England and is the sworn friend of Russia, upon whose power alone she relies for help against the Dreibund. Nor would any of the latter be acceptable to Russia. And it is useless concealing the spurious patriotism which makes the United States imagine that her interests lie in the weakening or humiliation of England, a sentiment which sufficiently excludes her good offices.

Another possible complication is France and Russia versus the Dreibund. England is out of the question as arbitrator, and the United States leans too much for obvious reasons, to France and Russia.

But let us ask: Does it accord with the dignity of the great powers to ask a second-rate or third-rate power to arbitrate?

A modification of arbitration is that it be submitted to competent lawyers. But natural, even though it be spurious, patriotism again enters here as a possible element, and amour propre is not an impotent factor in judgment.

Granted that kings, statesmen, and lawyers of high repute are gentlemen of honor, and as judges would always act as such, yet if this be so and always was so, how is it that so many wars have taken place between nations that refused all diplomatic settlement, including arbitration?

Not that the proposition to have a court of lawyers is at all a bad one. On the contrary, it is a decided step forward. But it is a suggestion which needs development.

At present it serves admirably to introduce what we mean by

PALESTINE THE SOLUTION OF WAR.

It is true that arbitration is the only becoming solution of the problem how to abolish war.

But there must be some established arbitrative power to which disputing nations can appeal.

- 1. It must be above suspicion.
- 2. It must be removed from any chance of being biased by any possible political considerations.
- 3. It must have a moral, and if need be, a physical force behind it to enforce its decisions.

There is but one arbitrative power which can fulfil all these

requirements, and we offer it because it comes from that book which has already given mankind so many practical ideals—the Bible.

But it involves the restoration of Palestine to the Hebrew nation. The mere suggestion of this opens a vista of practical results of tremendous importance, if we will only pause to merely glance at them. For it means:

- (a) The solution of the vexed Eastern question, the political rivalries and jealousies in the East. These affect all the powers, for England cannot afford to have another power on the highway between her and her Indian and Australian empires. France chafes already at England in Egypt. Austria and Italy have Mediterranean interests which may not be overshadowed; and Russia considers she is bound by political and religious motives to have Palestine herself.
- (b) The solution of religious rivalries and jealousies which affect the three great religious worlds of Catholic, Protestant, and Greek Church. None can afford to have the other supreme in the land whose very dust is so sacred to all.
- (c) The erection of the Hebrew nation by the powers into a neutral state, its boundaries prescribed by the Bible limitation (Gen. xv. 18-21; Deut. xi. 24), so that it could not possibly have any territorial ambition beyond them, nor could it ever be exposed to political intrigue for its own aggrandizement.
- (d) The opening up of a vast commerce, for which the Hebrews are peculiarly qualified by commercial genius, and for which they are prepared by their commercial establishments in all countries, which would be maintained and continued. (See Isa. lxi. 9.) In this commerce all nations would advantageously participate. For Palestine, geographically, is the natural converging point of the trade routes between two continents, Europe and Africa on one side, and two continents, Asia and Australia, on the other. Sidon, Elath, Ezion-Geber, Beyrout, Haifa, and Acre among her ports would speedily become the London, Marseilles, New York, or Hamburg of the East. And while to them the ships of the world would "fly as a cloud and as doves to their windows" (Isa. lx. 8), the hum of industry's pauseless fingers would be the psalm of life of myriads in a land once a granary of the world, the successors of the myriads of whose existence the countless ruins of to-day are the dumb but heart-moving witnesses.

- (e) It would mean the solution of the so-called Jewish question, whether it is Russian Pan-slav policy or Franco-German anti-semitism which propounds it. And the Hebrew nation of to-day, by its eminence in finance, letters, science, and trade, deserves attention for reasons which need not here be noted.
- (f) And it would mean the fulfilment of two Bible ideals of vital importance to humanity. The one is "a house of prayer for all nations" (Isa. lvi. 7). This would be erected in the same broad spirit which made King Solomon pray when he dedicated his temple: "And also the stranger who is not of Thy people Israel, and cometh from a far-off land, because of Thy Name, when they hear of Thy great Name and Thy strong hand and Thine outstretched arm, and he come and pray to this temple, O do Thou hear in Heaven the place of Thy dwelling and do all that the stranger crieth to Thee for!" (I. Kings viii. 41 seq.) This would mean the quickening of the idea of the Brotherhood of Man, recognizing the Father of all of us.

And the other ideal would be the institution of a world's court of arbitration, when "out of Zion shall go forth law, and He will judge between the nations and reprove many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation will not lift up sword against nation, neither will they learn war any more." (Isa. ii. 3-4; Micah iv. 2 and 3.)

If the codification of international law by the chief jurists of the world is the first step towards the solution of war and the education of public opinion to the cost, the injustice, the horror, and the shame of war is the second, this creation of an international court of arbitration is the final step and the guarantee of peace and its blessings. It would be based upon such codification, its force would rest secure in public opinion. The administration of international law would be intrusted to the said court. each member of which would be a graduate in international law, high in rank among the learned of the Hebrew nation, esteemed as an authority on the polity of nations by the world at large and known to be in life sans peur et sans reproche. We say Hebrews, because the Hebrew nation alone has and can have no political interests outside its Bible boundaries to bias its decision. tration, impartial and honorable, will thus be rendered by a court of a nation whose very existence will depend upon impartiality; whose past history will cry to it to judge righteously and fearlessly. Its environment will be the Temple, dedicated to the Father of all; and over its members will be the halo of religion.

That it would take years to codify international law and educate public opinion against war, yes. But what are a few years in view of the advantages to be ultimately gained? And it may be years before the final step can be taken, the restoration of Palestine to the Hebrews, for this is not to be until God's own time (Isa. lx. 22). The colonies, settled and settling there, seem but preparatory for their reception. But once a fait accompli, a general disarmament could then be safely expected and safely effected.

What if a nation should refuse to abide by the law going forth from Zion? It is a very remote contingency. The very treaty erecting Palestine into a neutral state, and clothing its court of international arbitration with its functions, would provide for just such a contingency. The moral force of the educated public opinion would speedily bring a recalcitrant nation to its senses. How could it withstand a threatened ostracism, or a combination of physical force or other penalties? But the time will come, it must come, when nations "will not learn war any more" and when humanity's watchwords at last will be Right and Reason instead of Might and Treason.

Before our eyes rises a picture of the nations restoring the Hebrews "as an offering," as the prophet phrases it (Isa. lxvi. 20): shall we say as "an amendment offering" for the injustice of lead-footed centuries? We dream of that martyr-nation of history, "despised and rejected," as that very prophet foretold, "wounded through others' transgressions, bruised through others' iniquities," at last rightly, justly, lovingly dealt with!

But with the picture and the dream, and far surpassing both in beauty, we behold a vision of peace and goodwill at last on earth—or as the psalmist grandly words it: "Love and truth meeting, righteousness and peace embracing, truth springing forth from earth, and charity looking down from heaven" (Ps. lxxxv.).

O that some statesman would crown his life by reaching out to turn war with its cost, curse, and crime, into a realization of the ideal of prophet and psalmist!

H. PEREIRA MENDES.